

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Andrew Flowers, #208833,)	C.A. #8:08-084-PMD-BHH
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
vs.)	<u>ORDER</u>
)	
Warden C. Reynolds,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
)	

This matter is before the court upon the magistrate judge's recommendation that petitioner's motion for summary judgment be denied. The record includes the report and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge made in accordance with this Court's Order of Reference and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). Because petitioner is pro se, this matter was referred to the magistrate judge.¹

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the magistrate judge's report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). No objections have been filed to the magistrate judge's report.

A review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge's report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the magistrate judge,

IT IS ORDERED that petitioner's motion for summary judgment [Doc. #37] is **DENIED**.

¹Pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 United States Code, § 636(b)(1)(B), and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(c), D.S.C., the magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters and submit findings and recommendations to this Court.

FURTHER ORDERED, that the magistrate judge's report and recommendation is adopted as the order of this Court.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.


PATRICK MICHAEL DUFFY
United States District Judge

September 17, 2008
Charleston, South Carolina

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Petitioner is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this Order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.